Case 3:07-cv-04448-JSW Document 4 Filed 09/05/2007 Page 1 of 3 1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 7 RAYMOND STROBEL, No. C 07-4448 JSW (PR) 8 Petitioner, **ORDER OF DISMISSAL: GRANTING** LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA 9 **PAUPERIS** v. WARDEN, CALIFORNIA MEN'S (Docket No. 2) 10 COLONY. 11 Respondent. 12 13 Petitioner, a prisoner of the State of California, currently incarcerated at the 14 California Men's Colony located in San Luis Obispo, California, filed this habeas corpus 15 action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging the constitutionality of his state 16 conviction or detention. Petitioner has also filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis 17 (docket no. 2) that is now GRANTED (docket no. 2) 18 The petition is now before the Court for review pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2243 and 19 Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. However, in the petition, Petitioner 20 clearly states that he has not exhausted any of his claims in the California Supreme Court in 21 that he did not appeal the plea agreement and that he did not file any previous "petitions, 22 applications or motions" with respect to this conviction in any court, state or federal[.]" 23 **DISCUSSION** 24 Standard of Review A. 25 This court may entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person 26

This court may entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a); *Rose v. Hodges*, 423 U.S. 19, 21 (1975).

27

28

DATED: September 5, 2007

IT IS SO ORDERED.

JEFFREY S. WHITE

United States District Judge

A district court shall "award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto." 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Summary dismissal is appropriate only where the allegations in the petition are vague or conclusory, palpably incredible, or patently frivolous or false. *See Hendricks v. Vasquez*, 908 F.2d 490, 491 (9th Cir. 1990) (quoting *Blackledge v. Allison*, 431 U.S. 63, 75-76 (1977)).

## B. <u>Exhaustion</u>

A prisoner in state custody who wishes to challenge either the fact or length of his confinement by filing a federal petition for writ of habeas corpus must first exhaust state judicial remedies, either on direct appeal or through collateral proceedings, by presenting the highest state court available with a fair opportunity to rule on the merits of each and every issue he seeks to raise in federal court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b),(c); *Granberry v. Greer*, 481 U.S. 129, 133-34 (1987). As Petitioner has not presented any of his claims to the highest state court, he has not exhausted his state court remedies. As such, the petition must be dismissed. *See Rose v. Lundy*, 455 U.S. 509, 510 (1982), *Raspberry v. Garcia*, 448 F.3d 1150, 1154 (9th Cir. 2006) (declining to extend the rule in *Rhines v. Webber*, 125 S. Ct. 1528, 1535 (2005) to completely unexhausted petitions and finding that the district court must dismiss such a petition based on *Jimenez v. Rice*, 276 F.3d 478, 481 (9th Cir. 2001)).

A dismissal solely for failure to exhaust is not a bar to Petitioner's returning to federal court after exhausting available state remedies. *See Trimble v. City of Santa Rosa*, 49 F.3d 583, 586 (9th Cir. 1995). Accordingly, this petition is DISMISSED without prejudice to Petitioner's filing a new federal habeas petition once he has exhausted state remedies by presenting his claims to the highest state court. The Clerk shall enter judgment and close the file.

Document 4

Filed 09/05/2007

Page 3 of 3

Case 3:07-cv-04448-JSW